IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY,)
Plaintiff,))) CIVIL ACTION NO. C-1-02-393
v.) Hon. Walter Herbert Rice
THE COCA-COLA COMPANY,) Hon. Sharon L. Ovington (Magistrate)
Defendant.)
)

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO RESPOND TO THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON THE COCA-COLA COMPANY'S DEFENSE OF EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL

The Coca-Cola Company ("Coca-Cola"), through counsel, respectfully moves for an enlargement of time to respond to The Procter & Gamble Company's ("P&G") Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on The Coca-Cola Company's Defense of Equitable Estoppel. Pursuant to the Local Rules, counsel for Coca-Cola have met and conferred with counsel for P&G and believe that P&G will oppose this Motion. A Proposed Order is attached.

On July 27, 2004, the previous deadline for filing motions for summary judgment, the parties agreed to file a Joint Motion to reschedule this deadline. *See* Docket No. 77. As grounds for this Joint Motion, the parties agreed that:

Because <u>any</u> summary judgment motion that the parties may file is contingent on this Court's claim construction decision, the parties respectfully request that the Court reschedule the present due date to 30 days following the issuance of the Court's decision on claim construction. The parties further request that all subsequent case deadlines be adjusted accordingly. Restructuring the schedule in this manner will serve to more efficiently utilize the resources of both the Court and the parties.

Id. at 1 (emphasis added). On July 29, 2004, the Court granted the Joint Motion. See Docket

No. 78. As a result, the due date for filing motions for summary judgment is currently 30 days

following the issuance of the Court's claim construction decision.

Coca-Cola respectfully submits that while P&G was not precluded from filing its motion,

the timing of its filing is premature. As the parties both previously explained to the Court, any

motion for summary judgment, including P&G's motion for partial summary judgment on the

issue of equitable estoppel, may be obviated by the Court's decision on claim construction of the

same patent at issue in P&G's motion. Accordingly, Coca-Cola respectfully requests an Order

extending the deadline for responding to P&G's motion until 30 days following the issuance of

the Court's decision on claim construction or in the alternative until April 20, 2005. Doing so

will preserve the resources of not only the parties, but the Court as well. In the event the Court

decides to deny this Motion, Coca-Cola respectfully requests that the Court extend the due date

for responding to P&G's motion for partial summary judgment until 21 days after the date of its

Order.

Dated: January 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY

By s/Roger J. Makley

Roger J. Makley (0018702)

Trial Attorney

33 West First Street, Suite 600

Dayton, Ohio 45402

Telephone: (937) 223-8177

Facsimile: (937) 223-6705

E-mail:

maklev@coollaw.com

TRIAL COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

THE COCA-COLA COMPANY

Of Counsel:

Donald R. Dunner, Esq.
Gerald F. Ivey, Esq.
Christopher P. Isaac, Esq.
Robert L. Burns, Esq.
Christopher W. Day, Esq.
Michele L. Mayberry, Esq.
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-3315
Telephone: (202) 408-4000
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400

Michael J. Kline, Esq. Michael V. Kruljac, Esq. The Coca-Cola Company P.O. Box 1734 Atlanta, GA 30301

Telephone: (404) 676-3162 Facsimile: (404) 676-7636

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 20, 2005, a copy of the foregoing THE COCA-COLA COMPANY'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO RESPOND TO THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON THE COCA-COLA COMPANY'S DEFENSE OF EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent to all parties by operation of the Court's CM/ECF and copies will be mailed via U.S. Mail to those parties to whom electronic notice has not been sent. Parties may access the filing through the Court's system.

s/ Roger J. Makley
Roger J. Makley

 $S: \backslash WDOX \backslash CLIENT \backslash 005634 \backslash 00376 \backslash 00213108.DOC$